



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

II.—THE ACCUSATIVE OF EXCLAMATION IN EPISTOLARY LATIN.

In Vol. XXIX of this Journal I concluded an article on "The Accusative of Exclamation in Plautus and Terence" as follows: "In subsequent papers I hope to show that the development here indicated for this construction in Latin comedy continued along similar lines for later writers and in other fields". Other tasks have hitherto prevented my fulfilling this promise, and it is not until now that I find myself in a position to add the second installment dealing with another literary *genre*, Epistolary Latin. I was led to choose this as the next field of study by the well-known resemblance between the diction of the comic drama and that of Cicero's letters, cf. Tyrrell, *The Correspondence of Cicero*, Vol. I, pp. 59ff. (second edition), and especially p. 64: "In the criticism of Cicero's letters we may go further, and say that to quote an analogous usage in Plautus or Terence is far more relevant than to quote an analogous usage from the Oratory or Philosophy of Cicero himself". In fact, one of the illustrations which Tyrrell cites of this close parallelism is the "copious use of ejaculatory phrases" (p. 61). In order to obtain a cross-section through the use of this construction by the classical aspirants for epistolary fame, I have joined to the instances in Cicero's correspondence those in the letters of Seneca and Pliny as well, though it need hardly be said that the numerous differences between these three authors render their juxtaposition in this way more or less mechanical.

The same year in which my first article was published there appeared the posthumous work of C. F. W. Müller as a supplement to Stolz's *Historische Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*, entitled *Syntax des Nominativs und Akkusativs im Lateinischen*. On pp. 159f. the "Akkusativ zum Ausdruck der Verwunderung, Bewunderung, des Unwillens, usw." receives the same sort of treatment as I complained of in my former paper. Müller's collection of examples is far from complete, only about one-fourth of the instances in Plautus being cited, and about one-sixth of

those in Terence, there is no attempt to set up categories, and no recognition of the fact that this construction has a history and course of development. The only rule formulated is as follows: "Cicero hat vor Sachen so vorherrschend *o*, dass die wenigen Stellen aus den Briefen an Atticus, an denen es fehlt, verdächtig werden (Rhein. Mus. 1898, S. 127 fgg.¹), bei Personen hingegen fehlt die Interjektion öfter (Coni. Tull., p. 13 fg., Q. fr. III, 4, 3, Pis. 1, 3, Rab. Post. 17, 45 m.). Die späteren scheinen keinen Unterschied gemacht zu haben". This law was first enunciated in Müller's *Coniecturae Tullianae* (Königsberg, 1860), pp. 13 f., was defended by him in *Rhein. Museum* LIII (1898), pp. 127 ff., and was observed in his edition of Cicero's letters. After initial misgivings it was accepted by Lehmann, *De Ciceronis ad Atticum Epistulis Recensendis et Emendandis* (1892), pp. 203 ff., and has exerted a great influence upon all editors of the letters during the last half century. It is true that the instances in the letters, examined by themselves, give a superficial plausibility to the rule; but I am convinced from a broader study of the construction that the rule is false and that the qualms which Lehmann felt at first are justified. Under all these circumstances it will be worth while to study the matter in more detail.

It will be noted that even Müller did not claim that his rule was observed by later authors ("die späteren"), and the usage of Seneca and Pliny will confirm this. Secondly, in Horace's *Satires*, which are also colloquial in tone and practically contemporaneous with the letters, occurs the phrase *divitias miseras!* (*Serm.* II, 8, 18), which violates Müller's law and which, thanks to the meter, defies emendation. Thirdly, it finds no substantiation in Cicero's predecessors. We have already noted the close stylistic resemblance of the letters to Latin comedy; but no confirmation for such a rule can be quoted from Plautus and Terence. Of course, I do not claim that Cicero's usage is identical with that of comedy—it is in fact quite different. But the one ought at least to be a natural outgrowth of the other; there ought to be only the same kind of a difference between the letters and Terence as there is between Terence and Plautus. And in my opinion this is exactly the case. Now in Plautus there are twelve instances of this construction without *o* (or any other interjection) "vor Sachen", and thirteen "bei Personen" (cf.

¹ This article was written by Müller himself.

A. J. P. XXIX, pp. 308 f.). In Terence there are four of the former,¹ and sixteen of the latter (in these are included eleven instances of *miseram me*, and two involving interrogative pronouns; cf. *ibid.*, pp. 312 f.). The fact of the matter is that Müller, never having collected the examples in early Latin, did not know the real situation and consequently had no foundation upon which to base conclusions about the construction at any later period. Finally, in my opinion, not even the instances in the letters, impartially considered, justify Müller's rule. The text of these instances, however, has been brought into such suspicion by his emendations that it will be advisable to postpone the consideration of them until the last. In the meanwhile, I hope that I have shifted the burden of proof. It is extremely unlikely that Cicero's usage in this particular stands entirely by itself. To prove that it does requires conclusive evidence; wholesale conjectures and forcing the critical method will not suffice.

Before analyzing the usage in Cicero's letters, it may be well to summarize the conclusions reached in my earlier paper, especially since I wish to alter the statement of them in one or two minor particulars. Apart from the matter of word order, which I advanced hesitatingly as perhaps due more to accident than to deliberate intention,² and theorizing as to the origin of different phases of the construction,³ the principal results are as follows:

I. Plautus' usage is exceedingly plastic. So far from *o* being required, it is not even the predominating construction, being considerably less frequent than both the non-interjectional and *edepol* categories and hardly more numerous than *hercle*. Full statistics are given in the table on p. 299 below.

II. (a) In Terence *o* has become the largest category, though the instances without any interjection are a close second. (b) Half of the latter consist of the phrase *me miserum*.⁴ (c) *ah*

¹ Nevertheless, Müller (*Coniecturae Tull.*, p. 14 n.) wrote: "A Terentio quidem ut eadem lex observata videatur, uno loco correcto opus est Phorm. 134".

Cf. A. J. P. XXIX, p. 305. This is, however, accepted at full value by Professor Skutsch in *Glotta* II (1910), p. 381.

² Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 307 f. and 313.

⁴ Cf. *ibid.*, p. 312. There are also a few examples in Plautus, cf. *ibid.*, p. 309.

occurs twice with personal pronouns.¹ (d) No interjection accompanies the construction, whenever an interrogative pronoun is part of the phrase.²

III. In both Plautus and Terence *heu* (*ehēu*)³ occurs rarely and only with personal pronouns.⁴

IV. In both Plautus and Terence, when a personal pronoun belongs to the construction, either no interjection is employed (cf. II [b]), or it is *heu* (cf. III) or *ah* (Terence only, cf. II [c]); *o* is never found.

In view of the development just sketched, what further alterations should we expect in the later history of the construction? The answer is not difficult. There would naturally be further extension of the *o* category, and there is but one direction in which any considerable extension can take place, viz.: at the expense of the non-interjectional usage. There is also the possibility that the personal pronouns will lose some of their repugnance to being associated with *o* in this construction. We shall soon see that these are exactly the lines of development followed.

I have found one hundred and nineteen instances of the accusative of exclamation in Cicero's letters.⁵ Of these 18% contain the word *res*, for which Cicero had an extraordinary fondness in this construction. Cf.

Ad Att. I, 16, 5: o di boni, rem perditam !⁶

V, 10, 3: o rem minime aptam meis moribus!

VI, 4, 1: o rem totam odiosam !

¹ Cf. Ter. Ad. vss. 309 f. :	ah
me miserum, uix sum compos animi,	
and ibid., vss. 329f. :	ah
me miserum !	

In my former paper I was reluctant to construe *ah* in these two instances directly with the following accusatives of exclamation, because they are separated by the verse end and because *ah* occurs nowhere else in comedy in this construction; but cf. Cic. *De Re Publica* I, 38, 59: a te infelicem, and Catullus XV, 17: ah te miserum and XXI, 11: ah me me.

² Cf. loc. cit., p. 313.

³ Cf. Ter. Hec. vs. 74; *heu me miserum*, the only example of *heu* in this construction in comedy and not cited in my first paper. I failed to cite also Phormio vs. 187; *heu me miserum*.

⁴ Cf. loc. cit., pp. 306 and 312.

⁵ The same limitations and restrictions are observed as in my former paper, cf. A. J. P. XXIX, pp. 303 f.

⁶ For the text of Cicero's letters I use the new edition by Purser in the Oxford Classical Texts.

- VII, 9, 3: o rem miseram !
 VII, 21, 1: o rem miseram et incredibilem !
 VII, 23, 1: o rem acerbam !
 VIII, 3, 6: 'o rem', inquis, 'difficilem et inexplicabilem !'
 VIII, 8, 1: o rem turpem et ea re miseram.
 VIII, 8, 2: o rem lugubrem !
 IX, 2a, 1: o rem difficilem planeque perditam !
 IX, 18, 2: o rem perditam !
 X, 4, 5: o rem miseram !
 X, 4, 8: o rem foedam !
 X, 11, 4: o rem undique miseram !
 XI, 7, 6: o rem miseram !
 XIII, 35, 1: o rem indignam !
 XV, 4a: o rem odiosam et inexplicabilem !
 XV, 5, 1: o rem miseram !
 XV, 9, 1: o rem miseram !
 Ad Fam. XII, 3, 2: o rem miseram !¹

It is noteworthy, though perhaps accidental, that in every one of the above instances the modifier follows the noun. The construction *o rem* + does not occur in Plautus and Terence. The only parallels are Plautus, Stich. 356: *edepol rem negotiossam*, Epid. 72: *eu edepol res turbulentas*, *ibid.* 212 and Stich. 379: *hercle rem gestam bene*, Miles 1056: *eu hercle odiosas res*, and Trin. 592: *edepol re gesta pessume gestam probe*. Possibly the fact, that in Plautus *edepol* (*eu edepol*) always, and *hercle* (*eu hercle*) usually take the above mentioned word order (cf. A. J. P. XXIX, p. 305), has something to do with the usage in Cicero.

The first instance above cited (ad Att. I, 16, 5) should also be noted. In his eagerness to attach as many *o*'s to the accusative of exclamation as possible Müller inserted a comma here in his edition, as follows: *o, di boni, rem perditam!* It is true that this is the only instance of this sort in the letters, but this punctuation ignores the use of *pro di immortales*, *pro deum fidem*, *pro Iuppiter*, and *o Iuppiter* as concomitants of this construction in comedy (cf. loc. cit., pp. 305 and 310 f.).

I shall now cite the other instances where *o* occurs "vor Sachen" according to Müller's rule, reserving until later such

¹Cf. also ad Att. VII, 25: [o] rem miseram and XIII, 22, 2: [o] rem acerbam, the text of which is discussed below, pp. 292 f. and 291 respectively.

nstances as involve a disputed text. Owing to Müller's arbitrary emendations, however, this exception involves practically all the instances which by any possibility may never have had the *o*.

Ad Att. II, 12, 1: *o* suavis epistulas tuas uno tempore mihi datas duas!

II, 21, 4: *o* spectaculum uni Crasso iucundum, ceteris non item!

IV, 19, 1: *o* exspectatas mihi tuas litteras!
o gratum adventum!
o constantiam promissi et fidem miram!
o navigationem amandam!

V, 10, 3: *o* illud verum *ἔρδοι τις*!¹

VI, 1, 18: *o* ἀνιστορησίαν turpem!

VII, 22, 1: *o* celeritatem incredibilem!

IX, 17, 1: *o* tempus miserum!

IX, 18, 2: *o* copias desperatas!

XI, 7, 3: *o* multas et gravis offensiones!

XII, 4, 1: *o* gratas tuas mihi iucundasque litteras!

XII, 5, 1: *o* stultitiam, nisi mea maior esset, singularem!

XII, 49, 2: *o* tempora! (followed by infinitive of exclamation).

XIII, 25, 3: *o* Academiam volaticam et sui similem!

XIII, 31, 4: *o* gulam insulsam!

XIII, 39, 1: *o* incredibilem vanitatem!

XIV, 16, 2: *o* Dolabellae nostri magnam ἀπιστείαν!

XV, 10: *o* Bruti amanter scriptas litteras!
o iniquum tuum tempus, qui etc.

XV, 12, 2: *o* negotia non ferenda! quae feruntur tamen.

XVI, 5, 4: *o* dies in auspiciis Lepidi <lepidē> descriptos et apte ad consilium reditus nostri!

XVI, 13a, 1: *o* casum mirificum!

Ad Brut. I, 17, 4: *o* magnam stultitiam timoris, id ipsum, quod verearis, ita cavere, ut, cum vitare fortasse potueris, ultro accersas et attrahas.²

¹ Immediately preceded by *o* rem minime aptam meis moribus (already quoted).

² Written by Brutus to Atticus.

[Ad Octav.] 6: o meam calamitosam ac praecipitem senectutem!

o turpem exacta dementique aetate canitiem!

7: o miseram et in brevi tam celerem et tam variam rei publicae commutationem!

Ad Fam. VII, 12, 1: o castra praecleara!

X, 14, 1: o gratam famam biduo ante victoriam de subsidio tuo, de studio, de celeritate, de copiis!

XI, 28, 3: o superbiam inauditam alios in facinore gloriari, aliis ne dolere quidem impunite licere!

XII, 23, 1: o multa intolerabilia locis omnibus!

Ad Quint. Frat. II, 6, 1: o litteras mihi tuas iucundissimas expectatas, ac primo quidem cum desiderio, nunc vero etiam cum timore!

II, 15, 4: o iucundas mihi tuas de Britannia litteras!¹

There is nothing remarkable about the above list, which could easily be paralleled from Plautus and Terence.

Passing by for the present those instances where there is a possibility that Cicero did not employ *o* "vor Sachen", let us consider the use of *o* "bei Personen".

Ad Att. II, 2, 2: o magnum hominem et unde multo plura didiceris quam de Procilio!

IV, 13, 2: o hominem nequam!

IV, 15, 7: o virum!
o civem!

VII, 11, 1: o hominem amentem et miserum qui etc.

VII, 18, 2: o perditum latronem!

X, 16, 3: o, si id fuerit, turpem Catonem!

XII, 2, 2: o miros homines!

XII, 38, 2: o hominem cavendum!

XIII, 46, 3: o Vestorium neglegentem!

XIII, 47: o magistrum molestum!

XIII, 52, 1: o hospitem mihi tam gravem ἀμεταμέλητον!

XIV, 1, 1: o prudentem Oppium! qui etc.

XIV, 15, 1: o mirificum Dolabellam meum!

¹Cf. also three instances in Ad Att. X, 14, 1 and XIV, 16, 1 on p. 292 below.

XIV, 17, 3: o perditum hominem!

XIV, 18, 1: o hominem impudentem!

XV, 27, 3: o turpem sororis tuae filium!

XVI, 14, 2: o Sesti tabellarium hominem nequam!

Ad Fam. VII, 20, 3: o medicum suavem!

IX, 20, 1: o hominem facilem!

o hospitem non gravem!

XII, 30, 3: o hominem semper illum quidem mihi
aptum, nunc vero etiam suavem!

In the above category Cicero displays almost as much fondness for the word *homo* (10 out of 22 instances¹) as we have previously (p. 279) noted for the word *res*.

It is illuminating to bring into immediate juxtaposition with the above those passages where *o* does not appear "bei Personen".

Ad Att. X, 3a, 2: homines ridiculos!

XIII, 44, 1: populum vero praeclarum quod etc.

XV, 3, 2: de sella Caesaris bene tribuni; praeclaros
etiam XIV ordines!

XV, 13, 3: Itane Gallo Caninio? <o> hominem ne-
quam! quid enim dicam aliud?

cautum Marcellum! me² sic, sed non tamen
cautissimum.

Ad Fam. V, 2, 8: hominem gravem et civem egregium!
qui etc.

IX, 20, 1: at quem virum! non eum, quem etc.

Ad Quint. Frat. I, 2, 6: quem hominem! qua ira! quo spiritu!

III, 4, 3: lepidum amicum Sallustium, qui etc.

In this group ad Att. XV, 13, 3 is especially instructive. No manuscript reads *o* at this point. It was first inserted by Manutius in his edition (Venice, 1563). This insertion is not only unnecessary *per se* but is rendered still less plausible by the fact that no *o* appears with *cautum Marcellum* in the next phrase but one thereafter. Manutius' 1563 edition is inaccessible to me, but I have consulted the 1570 edition "cum correctionibus P. Manutii et annotationibus D. Lambini". This reads *ita ne Gallo? o hominem*, etc. The word *Caninio* in Purser's text is due to

¹ Note also four others in the next group.

² The last part of this citation belongs below (p. 286); it is quoted here to complete the context.

Corradus; M reads *Gallo animo*. Lambinus (p. 393 of the 1570 edition) reports the MSS as reading *Gallo aninio* and himself accepts Corradus' emendation. It should be noted that Manutius dropped *aninio* from his text. Now no reader accustomed to watching grammatical details, let alone an editor, could fail to observe that *o* predominates with the accusative of exclamation in Cicero. Therefore, when Manutius could discover no meaning in *aninio* and decided not to print the word in his text, he did not delete it entirely; the last letter he retained and construed with the next phrase. If Manutius had employed the same conventional system as modern editors, his text would have read *ita ne Gallo? [anini]o hominem nequam*, etc. This, in my opinion, is the origin of *o* in this place. But not only do other, undoubted instances of *hominem* + without *o* occur elsewhere in Cicero (see last list), but they are also numerous in Plautus and Terence (cf. my previous paper *passim*). Again, the text without *o* is the *lectio difficilior*, and as such is entitled to the preference. Lehmann (De Cic. ad Att. Epistulis Recensendis et Emendandis, p. 203) viewed the whole problem in the proper light: "Nam ut Livius, Tacitus alique scriptores dicendi genere saepe utuntur ad normam regulamque directo atque certis legibus vinculisque constricto, ita Cicero, arbiter ille potentissimus orationis, tam libere tamque solute in scribendo versatur, ut cavendum putemus, ne tali ratione ipse Cicero potius corrumpatur quam scribarum errores corrigantur. Sane facile est ita concludere: 'Viginti locis Cicero hoc vocabulo utitur; uno loco lectio abhorret; age, corrigamus atque Ciceronis genus dicendi sequamur'. Facile ita concluditur neque vero recte; nam tam Proteus Cicero est in oratione varianda, ut certum eius genus dicendi saepius non facileprehendatur". This is a sensible position; and if Lehmann was afterwards induced to abandon it, we have only another illustration of the fact that, despite the old proverb, first thoughts are sometimes best. In fact, Lehmann's initial attitude was even stronger than he supposed, for he accepted Müller's statement of the facts without serious question and did not know how vulnerable it was at many points.

As to ad Fam. IX, 20, 1 and ad Quint. Frat. I, 2, 6 it should be noted that these fall under rule II (d) on p. 279 above; cf. also ad Att. X, 17, 1 (p. 287 below).

For reasons which will presently appear, I have omitted from the last two lists all instances involving personal pronouns, which

Müller rightly included under his "bei Personen" category. With this exception, then, Müller's concession (*Syntax des Nom. u. Akkus. im Latein.*, p. 160) that "bei Personen hingegen fehlt die Interjektion öfter" (sc. als vor Sachen) rests entirely upon these two lists, in which *o* is omitted ten times out of thirty-two instances.

We have seen (pp. 277 f. above) that Müller's rule as a whole finds no substantiation in writers later than Cicero, in his contemporary (Horace), or in his predecessors (Plautus and Terence). This particular phase of his rule fares no better than the whole. So far from there being any special tendency in Cicero's letters to omit *o* "bei Personen", the ratio of omissions is actually higher in Plautus and Terence. Out of 16 instances in Plautus (pronouns are again omitted) *o* fails to occur in ten, or 62% (cf. A. J. P. XXIX, pp. 306 and 309); in Terence the percentage of omissions is 33, five out of fifteen (cf. *ibid.* pp. 311 f. and 312 f.).¹ We have just noted that in Cicero the proportion was 10 in 32, or 31%.

We have now to consider the instances which involve personal pronouns. Here a new, but perfectly natural,² development awaits us; *o* occurs as follows:

Ad Att. VII, 23, 1: o me miserum!

XIII, 29, 3: o te ferreum, qui illius periculis non moveris!

[Ad Octav.] 6: o me numquam sapientem et aliquando id quod non eram frustra existimatum!

Ad Fam. VII, 20, 3: o medicum suavem³ meque docilem ad hanc disciplinam!

XIV, 4, 3: o me perditum,
o adffictum!

Ad Quint. Frat. III, 1, 17: o me sollicitum!

As we have seen (rule IV on p. 279 above), this usage does not occur in Plautus or Terence; yet there is no reason to suspect the text here. It is found in Cicero's other writings, in Horace

¹ In Plautus "vor Sachen" *o* is omitted twelve times out of 19, or 63%; in Terence the ratio is 4 in 20, or 20%. The percentage in the letters depends upon the text adopted in the passages still to be discussed, pp. 286-94 below.

² Cf. p. 279 above.

³ The first half of this quotation has already been cited in its proper place (p. 283), but is repeated here to give the context of the second half.

Serm. I, 9, 11 f.: *o te, Bolane, cerebri felicem*, and in later authors. The pronouns, however, do not abandon the whole field to *o* at once; in the greater number of cases the old usage prevails:

Ad Att. II, 19, 1: *me miserum!*

III, 20, 1: *me miserum!*

IX, 6, 6: *me miserum, quod tu non valuisti!*

IX, 12, 1: *miseros nos!*

X, 10, 1: *me caecum, qui haec ante non viderim!*

XV, 13, 3: *hominem nequam! quid enim dicam aliud? cautum Marcellum!*¹ *me sic, sed non tamen cautissimum!*

Ad Fam. III, 11, 2: *me miserum, qui non adfuerim!*

XIV, 1, 1: *me miserum!* (followed by two infinitives of exclamation)

XIV, 1, 5: *quid, obsecro te, me miserum! quid futurum est?*

Ad Quint. Frat. I, 4, 4: *sin plane occidimus, me miserum!*

These two lists must bear the main burden of proof for Müller's statement that "*bei Personen hingegen fehlt die Interjektion öfter*" (sc. als vor Sachen), for we have already seen (p. 285) that this statement finds little substantiation "*bei Personen*" other than pronouns. In fact, had Müller written "*bei Pronomina*" instead of "*bei Personen*", his statement would have corresponded to the actual usage in Cicero's letters; but even so, it would have been misleading in view of the construction's earlier history. So far from there being a special tendency in the letters to omit *o* with pronouns, the situation is just the opposite. Cicero has introduced the *o* in seven passages where Plautus and Terence would not have used it. The 60% of pronouns without *o* represent no innovation, but resistance to the pressure of a new development.

Finally, we come to the omission of *o* "*vor Sachen*", a matter complicated in most cases by more or less uncertainty as to the text. Müller (Coniect. Tull., p. 13) was willing to concede but five passages (ad Att. II, 14, 2; X, 10, 6; XIII, 33, 1; XIII, 44, 1; and XIV, 5, 2), where there was the least chance of the interjection's being absent. To these Lehmann (De Cic. ad Att.

¹ Cf. previous note. Manutius' insertion of *o* at the beginning has been discussed on pp. 283 f. above.

Epist. Rec. et Em., pp. 204 f.) added seven others (ad Att. VII, 18, 2; VII, 25; X, 14, 1 (bis); XIII, 6a; XIII, 22, 2; and XIV, 16, 1), and Müller accepted this extension to his list (Rhein. Mus. LIII [1898], p. 128). In every one of these doubtful cases, however, both Müller and Lehmann decided in favor of the *o*. In my opinion, still three other passages must also be considered (ad Att. II, 13, 1; VIII, 5, 1; and X, 17, 1).

The first instance to be considered belongs to an old category.

Ad Att. X, 17, 1: quam in me incredibilem ἐκτέλειαν!¹

This comes under rule II (d), p. 279 above, of which we have seen illustrations also in ad Fam. IX, 20, 1 and ad Quint. Frat. I, 2, 6 (p. 283 above).

Ad Att. II, 13, 1: facinus indignum! epistulam αὐθαρεῖ tibi a
Tribus Tabernis rescriptam ad tuas
suavissimas epistulas neminem reddi-
disse!

Müller (Coniect. Tull., p. 13, n. 2) refused to consider this an accusative of exclamation, and of course he had a perfect right to do so. But in my opinion the fact that an infinitive of exclamation follows is decisive, cf. ad Att. XII, 49, 2 (p. 281 above) and ad Fam. XIV, 1, 1 (p. 286 above).²

Ad Att. X, 10, 6: <o> vim incredibilem molestiarum!

There is not a scrap of manuscript evidence for reading *o* here. It was conjectured by Müller (Coniect. Tull., p. 13), in order to make this passage fit into his theory. Lehmann (loc. cit., p. 204) accepts it for the same reason, but without a single word of defense, though (as we shall see) he has found some sort of defense for every other instance. The situation was thus desperate enough, even when Müller's law seemed to require the emendation. Now that the earlier history of the construction is becoming known and the instances in Cicero are seen in their true light, the insertion of *o* is absolutely uncalled for.

Ad Att. II, 14, 2: <o> occasionem mirificam, si qui nunc
dum hi apud me sunt emere de me
fundum Formianum velit!

¹ There is a corruption in the context, but no reason to suspect this phrase.

² Several examples of *o* facinus indignum in Terence are cited in A. J. P. XXIX, p. 311. In one case, Eun. 70, most editors delete the *o* for metrical reasons.

Again, the *o* has no manuscript authority and merely represents a conjecture by Müller (loc. cit., p. 13) for the same purpose as before. Lehmann (loc. cit., p. 204) defends it on the principle of haplography. When needed, this is a useful and valuable paleographical principle. But we have already found three undoubted examples of *o* being omitted "vor Sachen", and still more are to follow. Haplography should find no welcome here.

Ad Att. XIII, 44, 1: *o* *suavis* *tuas* *litteras*! (etsi *acerba* *pompa*.
Verum tamen *scire* *omnia* *non* *acerbum*
est, vel de Cotta) *populum* ¹ *vero* *prae-*
clarum *quod* *propter* *malum* *vicinum*
ne *Victoriae* *quidem* *ploditur*!

o does not appear in M at this point and was conjectured by Müller (loc. cit., p. 13).² It is defended by Lehmann (loc. cit., pp. 138 and 204) because letter 44 in this book appears in the manuscripts as a continuation of letter 43 and because the last word of 43, *post*, takes the form *posco* in three MSS, O, R, and P. It is well known that the modern division of books XII and XIII into separate letters rests upon no ancient authority; in M each book is written as an unbroken whole. Some of the early printed editions divide book XII into as few as four letters! In the editio Hervagiana (Basel, 1533) the line of demarcation is incorrectly put before instead of after *post*, so that letter 44 begins *Post suavis*, etc. This circumstance led O. E. Schmidt (Der Briefwechsel des M. Tullius Cicero, p. 457 n) to the following refutation of Lehmann's argument: "Dieser Briefanfang hat mir die Augen geöffnet über die wahre Natur einer Lesart in ORP, die Lehmann als eine der Hauptbeweisstellen der Echtheit und Unabhängigkeit dieser Überlieferung von M betrachtet. M liest nämlich *consequemur biduo post. Suaves tuas litteras*; die genannten Hdn. dagegen *consequemur biduo. Posco suaves tuas litteras*. In dem *o* vor *suaves* fand nun Lehmann jene Interjektion, die C. F. W. Müller hier und an anderen Stellen durch Konjektur einsetzen will. In Wahrheit verhält sich die Sache so: erst wurde der Text anders abgeteilt als in M, so dass *post*

¹ This instance has already been cited on p. 283.

² Müller cited ad Att. II, 12, 1: *o* *suavis* *epistulas* *tuas*. He might have cited also ad Att. IV, 19, 1; XII, 4, 1; XV, 10; ad Quint. Frat. II, 6, 1; and II, 15, 4 (see pp. 281 f. above). But these parallels prove nothing.

den nächsten Satz eröffnete, und dann durch Konjektur dieses *post* in *posco* verwandelt, weil der Gedanke, dass Cicero die angenehmen brieflichen Plaudereien des Atticus erwartet, so oft eine Rolle spielt, z. B. XII, 4, 1; 16, 2; 46, 2; etc." This convincing refutation was naturally not acceptable to Müller (Rhein. Mus. LIII [1898], pp. 128 f.), who nevertheless had nothing tangible to offer in rebuttal. Schmidt's conclusion finds further support in the fact that the other accusative of exclamation in the same sentence (*populum vero praeclarum*, etc.) also has no *o*.

Ad Att. XIII, 33, 1: <o>neglegentiam miram!

Still again the *o* rests entirely upon Müller's conjecture (loc. cit., p. 13). Lehmann (loc. cit., p. 204) supports it as follows: "quod graeca vocabula antecedunt, *o* facile omittebatur". It must be frankly conceded that Greek words are a frequent source of corruption in the text. But in this particular instance the Greek words at the close of the previous letter (*πομπεύσαι καὶ τοῖς προσώποις*) have come through safely, and we have now seen that an accusative of exclamation without *o* need not be ipso facto an object of suspicion.

Ad Att. XIII, 6a: <o>operam tuam multam qui et haec
cures et mea expedias et sis in tuis non
multo minus diligens quam in meis!

This was the passage which caused Müller to point out the prevalence of *o* with the accusative of exclamation in Cicero (loc. cit., pp. 13 f.). He did not consider this an example, however, but proposed to read *mult*<um> *am*<o>. Lehmann, on the other hand, proved that *non* (before *multo*) belonged in the text and that this was inconsistent with Müller's emendation (loc. cit., pp. 204 f.). Therefore, he had recourse to the old expedient and inserted *o*. Haplography can again be the only justification for this reading, and we have already seen (p. 288 above) that its assistance is supererogatory in cases like this.

Ad Att. XIV, 5, 2: *o* meam stultam verecundiam! qui etc.

The sole support for reading *o* here is that it appeared in Cratander's edition (Basel, 1528); Müller was ignorant of this fact and placed the interjection in his text by emendation. Tyrrell conjectured *en*. Lehmann (loc. cit., p. 204) defends *o* as follows: "Muellerus coniecit <o> ; nunc nihil est, quod quis conici-

endum putet; nam istud *o* Cratander primus in textu posuit, atque ille quidem ex codicibus; nisi forte quis credit, Cratandrum eadem atque Muellerum studia in Ciceronis genere dicendi posuisse"; cf. also *ibid.*, p. 77. It is at once apparent that this passage stands somewhat apart from those previously considered, since here the *o* is not merely the conjecture of a modern editor, but actually appears in Cratander's edition. The question immediately arises as to the value of this evidence and (more specifically) as to whether Cratander's text was derived from manuscripts now lost, as Lehmann supposes, or merely represents an emendation on his part. Lehmann considers the latter alternative impossible unless we assume that Cratander had made as careful a study of this construction as Müller has since done. But in a similar passage already considered (pp. 283 f. above) we have seen that such an assumption is unnecessary. No careful scholar could fail to note the prevalence of *o* with the construction, and it was the path of least resistance for any editor or commentator (in whatever century) upon any author (of any period) to supply the *o*, whenever his attention happened to be directed to the matter. Thus, upon Ter. Eun. 418 Donatus commented as follows: "*hominem perditum) deest 'o', ut sit: o hominem perditum. sed sic melius sonat; maioris enim stuporis est hoc modo pronuntiatum*" (Wessner, I, p. 362).¹ It is therefore easy to see how Cratander (or if Cratander found the *o* in some manuscript, the process is merely pushed back one step further to that manuscript's scribe) came to insert the *o*. If it should be asked, why then Cratander did not proceed to emend every other such instance, the answer is not far to seek: the text is bulky and an editor has innumerable problems to engage his attention and no special interest in this one—at least not until Müller brought it into the limelight. Even Müller, who attempted to cite every case in question, failed, as we have seen (pp. 286 f. above), to notice half of them. Something called Cratander's attention to the matter here. He was nearing the end of his task and had an impression that *o* belonged to the construction. Accordingly, he introduced it into his text and bothered his head with the matter no further. But now the problem cannot be dismissed so cavalierly. In this matter I am willing to follow the general principle

¹From such language one would suppose that this usage was unique in Terence! For another instance, cf. Pliny, Epist. II, 20, 5 and my comment, p. 297, note 3 (end), below.

which Lehmann himself (loc. cit., p. 84) has formulated for evaluating such readings in Cratander: "c, i. e. lectiones a Cratandro in textu novatae, codicis instar sunt, ubicumque cum iis codicibus qui nunc exstant aut cum Z, v. c. consentiunt; ubicumque c neque in iis, quibus nos utimur, codicibus est neque in Z, v. c. videtur fuisse, unum iudicium valeto: si c veram atque necessariam lectionem esse apparebit, in textum recipiatur; si id iudicio non efficietur, ne recipiatur neve tamen neglegatur, quod nescimus, an ita codices Cratandri habuerint". Surely no one can longer maintain that in this case *c* provides a "necessariam lectionem".¹

Ad Att. XIII, 22, 2: o rem acerbam!

In this passage *o* is read by c, v. c., and codd. Bosii, and is omitted by O, R, P, M, and s. (cf. Lehmann, loc. cit., p. 204). The value of *c* we have just discussed; Bosius' unsavory reputation in matters of this kind (cf. Schanz, Geschichte d. röm. Literatur, I, 2, p. 333, 3d ed.) prevents much stress being laid upon his "codices"; v. c. refers to "lectiones veteris codicis (fortasse Z) in margine ed. Lambinianae posterioris". Concerning the value of these readings, under the conditions which here prevail, Lehmann expressed himself as follows: "v. c., ubicumque $\Sigma + \Delta$ ab eo dissentit neque Z adest, non ille quidem plane reiiciendus, sed caute adhibendus est" (loc. cit., p. 95). Finally, there is probably realized here the fear which Lehmann expresses on p. 92 of his book, viz.: "ne quid ex editione Bosiana a. 1580 in ed. post. Lambinianam a. 1584 migrasset atque ea re auctoritas eius minueretur". To choose these authorities, which must be used "caute", "subtili iudicio", and only when they provide a "veram atque necessariam lectionem", in preference to manuscripts like O, R, P, M, and s, especially when there is nothing blameworthy in the latter reading, would be the height of absurdity.

Ad Att. VII, 18, 2: o perditum latronem!² o vix ullo otio
compensandam hanc rei publicae tur-
pitudinem!

¹ The latest authority is still more favorable to my contention, cf. Sjögren, Commentationes Tullianae (Upsala, 1910), p. 94: "Hoc igitur pro certo habemus, editionem Cratandrinam nec pro fundamento recensionis esse habendam et subtili iudicio adhibendam.

² This instance has already been cited on p. 282 above. It is repeated to give the context for what follows.

The second *o* is vouched for by Card. Mal., l, and ZB (cf. Lehmann, loc. cit., p. 204); it is omitted in N, H, O, P, M, and s. The situation here is very similar to that in the last passage. ZB refers to the readings which Bosius claimed to have taken from Z. In spite of efforts to rehabilitate Bosius' reputation in connection with this particular manuscript, suspicion must inevitably rest upon any reading so derived. By l are meant "lectiones a Lambino in textu ed. prioris novatae"; of these Lehmann (loc. cit., p. 88) says: "multo cautius l adhibenda est quam c". By Card. Mal. is meant a manuscript once belonging to Nicolaus Cardinal Rodulfus, which was used by Malaspina in a book of critical notes (Venice, 1563). Surely these authorities in a matter of this sort can not be thought to outweigh N, H, O, P, M, and s.

Ad Att. XIV, 16, 1: renavigare. O loca ceteroqui valde expetenda, interpellantium autem multitudine paene fugienda.

This text is read by M², v. c., and R. M¹ reads renavigareo; E and O omit *o*. In my opinion, the evidence is in favor of *o*, and this instance should be added to those on p. 282 above.

Ad Att. X, 14, 1: o vitam miseram maiusque malum tam diu timere quam est illud ipsum quod timetur.

Lehmann (loc. cit., p. 204) summarizes the situation as follows: "*o* scribendum esse inde apparet, quod M et P illud *o* cum graeco vocabulo quod antecedit coniunxerunt; *o* evanuit in O et R; adest in W, adfuisse denique *o* in Z inde suspicor, quod Lambinus, qui in editione priore *o* omittit, in *Erratis* eius voluminis *o* inserit". Cf. also Müller, Rh. Mus. LIII (1898), p. 129. In my judgment, Lehmann has made out his case and *o* should be read; consequently, these two instances should be added to those on p. 282 above.

Ad Att. VII, 25: o rem miseram!

The more or less untrustworthy authorities with which we have just been dealing (Ant., l, q. v. c. et L(mgo), codd. Bosii) plus Σ (ORP) have *o* in this passage as against Δ (M, s), which omits it (cf. Lehmann, loc. cit., p. 204). Of course, if either set of

authorities presented an obviously and intrinsically "veram et necessariam lectionem", our course would be clear. As it is, the decision must depend upon technical grounds, upon the comparative values and relationships of the different manuscripts. Unfortunately, no unanimity has yet been obtained on these questions. Lehmann and those who accept his conclusions would unhesitatingly pronounce in favor of the authorities cited first. But O. E. Schmidt with adherents perhaps no less numerous would be likely to prefer Δ. Schmidt (Philologus LV [1896], p. 726) has summarized his views succinctly and forcefully: "Da von W nur geringe Bruckstücke übrig sind und die nicht sehr zahlreichen aus W herübergenommenen Lesarten in C und c sich mit Konjekturen und Interpolationen in schwer lösbarer Gemeinschaft befinden, da Z verloren ist, das aber, was Lambin und Bosius aus Z melden, nicht immer mit Z identisch, noch weniger aber von Konjekturen und Interpolationen frei ist, da s contaminirte Hdn. sind, die neben sehr wenigen M ergänzenden guten Lesarten zahlreiche Konjekturen und Interpolationen aufweisen, da ferner auch der Veronensis und Petrarca's Abschrift daraus verloren ist, so bleibt der Text von M¹ als der einzige zusammenhängende, unverfälschte Text der Atticusbriefe die Grundlage der Textgestaltung". This view is also accepted by Schanz, cf. Geschichte d. röm. Literatur, I, 2, p. 334 (3rd edition): "Aus dieser Darstellung geht hervor, dass für unsere Briefe, obwohl es stets Pflicht der Herausgeber sein wird, alle genannten Textesquellen soweit als möglich zu rekonstruieren, doch immer der Mediceus 49, 18 Führer sein wird". Towards this view I am myself inclined and therefore judge that in the passage before us *o* should not be read.

Ad Att. VIII, 5, 1: *sed en meam mansuetudinem!*

The *en* is due to Tyrrell; M reads *sed in eam*; s, P, *sed meam*; R, *sede meam*; O, *sede in eam*; L(mgo), ZB, *sed o meam*. Lehmann (loc. cit., p. 99) prefers the last, which is the vulgate. Strange to relate, this was unacceptable to Müller, who proposed *sed <vide>* (cf. Rh. Mus. LIII [1898], p. 127). There can be no doubt that Δ read *sed meam*, and little doubt that s read the same. In view of the paleographical importance of M and of the not inconsiderable list of instances in which this construction takes no *o*, I am of the opinion that *sed meam* should be our text at this point.

If my judgment is accepted in the foregoing discussion, we find twelve passages (out of the fifteen considered¹) where *o* does not occur "vor Sachen". Accordingly, we obtain the following table of percentages:

	Plautus	Terence	Cicero
<i>o</i> omitted "vor Sachen".....	63%	20%	17%
<i>o</i> omitted "bei Personen" other than personal pronouns.....	62%	33%	31%
<i>o</i> omitted with personal pronouns.....	100%	100%	60%

As already stated (p. 279 above) these developments were to be expected. That portion of Müller's law which declares that *o* is omitted more frequently "bei Personen" than "vor Sachen" in Cicero's letters is baldly true, but is also without special significance and in view of the construction's history is actually misleading. A résumé of Cicero's usage as a whole will be found in the table at the end of this paper.

In view of the rapid extension of the *o* category and the large rôle always played by such phrases as *me miserum*, *te infelicem*, etc., in the history of the construction, it would not be surprising if the tone of commiseration, pity, deprecation, disgust, etc., inherent in these phrases should be transferred to the non-interjectional usage as a whole. Furthermore, since these phrases are frequently not seriously intended, a secondary connotation of irony, banter, derision, mock modesty, etc., might also easily arise. I believe that both developments had already begun in Cicero's time. My present collections of instances do not enable me to define exactly the rise or extent of this usage. It seems to have played no part worth mentioning in Plautus and Terence. But in Horace it is found at Serm. II, 8, 18: *divitias miseras!* In Cicero's letters we are still in the early stages of this development. In ad Att. XIV, 5, 2, *meam stultam verecundiam*² is equivalent to *me stultum verecundia* and in tone is the same as *me miserum*. In ad Quint. Frat. III, 4, 3: *lepidum amicum Sallustium, qui mihi aut inimicitias putet periculosas subeundas fuisse aut infamiam sempiternam!* the irony is self-evident. In ad Fam. V, 2, 8, *hominem gravem et civem egregium!* is a sarcastic fling at Q. Caecilius Metellus Nepos in a letter to his

¹ I. e. in addition to the fifty-seven instances without *o* already cited on pp. 279-82 above.

² See next note.

brother, Q. Metellus Celer. Ad Att. XIII, 33, 1: *neglegentiam miram!*¹ Atticus had accused Cicero of carelessness in regard to filing a statement of his income as required by law. Inasmuch as Cicero had sent an agent for this very purpose and had been repeatedly assured that the matter had received attention, he ironically begins his letter as above. Ad Att. VIII, 5, 1: *sed meam mansuetudinem!*¹ Cicero was seeking to recall a caustic letter which he had sent to his freedman, Dionysius, in care of Atticus. He wishes to emphasize to Atticus the generosity of this procedure on his part and at the same time to avoid the appearance of boasting. The tone of mock deprecation is neatly expressed by the accusative of exclamation without *o*. There are several other passages in the letters which could plausibly be cited in this connection; but it is unnecessary to do so, since I freely admit that this development is a new one and consequently that an omitted *o* does not necessarily involve this significance. On the contrary, it should also be noted that the accusative of exclamation may be sarcastic in tone and nevertheless be accompanied by *o*.

The epistolary form of Seneca's *Epistulae ad Lucilium* is largely make-believe; they are really nothing but philosophical disquisitions in disguise. It is therefore natural that so colloquial and informal a construction as the accusative of exclamation should occur in them less frequently than in any of the writers hitherto studied. Nevertheless, some twenty-two instances occur.

XCVII, 4: *o boni, rem perditam!*²

stands alone in its class, but is an acknowledged quotation from Cic., Att. I, 16, 5, cf. p. 279 above.

XLIII, 5: *o te miserum, si contemnis hunc testem!*

XLVI, 3: *o te hominem felicem, quod etc.*

LVI, 3: *o te, inquis, ferreum aut surdum, cui etc.*

Instances like these have already been noted in Cicero, p. 285 above. In Seneca, however, there is no example of a personal pronoun without *o*. The following instances are of the usual type and present no unusual features:

XI, 9: *o felicem illum, qui etc.*
o felicem, qui etc.

¹ The text of these passages is discussed on pp. 289 f. and 293 above.

² Citations are from Otto Hense's edition, 1898.

XLVIII, 7: o pueriles ineptias!

LXIII, 2: o infelicem stultitiam!

LXVIII, 8: o magnum virum!

LXX, 21: o virum fortem!

o¹ dignum, cui fati daretur electio!

LXXVIII, 23: o infelicem aegrum!

LXXVIII, 24: o infelicem aegrum!

LXXXII, 12: o hominem dignum, qui etc.

LXXXII, 21: o efficacem contionem!

LXXXVI, 11: o hominem calamitosum!

LXXXVIII, 13: o egregiam artem!

LXXXVIII, 38: o hominem litteratum!

o virum bonum!

IC, 31: o dementia nostram!

CXIII, 26: o tristes ineptias!

There remains only CIV, 28: haec usque eo animum Socratis non moverant, ut ne vultum quidem moverent. <o>illam mirabilem laudem et singularem: usque ad extremum nec hilariorum quisquam nec tristiorum Socraten vidit. The *o* here is due entirely to Buecheler and does not appear in the manuscripts. In view of our preceding study the emendation is unnecessary. This will seem the more likely when it is observed that the exclamation is ironical. Seneca does not seriously mean that Socrates' ἀπάθεια was unique and surprising, but just the opposite. Every Stoic could do as much. In § 25 he asks: quid est cur timeat laborem vir, mortem homo? and in § 26: denique quem umquam ista destituere temptantem? cui non faciliora apparere in actu? non quia difficilia sunt, non audemus, sed quia non audemus, difficilia sunt. He then cites Socrates as an example and narrates his numerous trials and afflictions, concluding as above. His object was not to prove that Socrates was exceptional but that we all ought and could do the same.²

It should again be noted that this sarcastic usage without *o* does not prevent a sarcastic implication in the passages with *o*. Several of the instances above cited would prove the contrary.

As regards formality Pliny's Epistulae lie midway between those of Cicero and Seneca, and his use of the accusative of ex-

O is omitted in p.

²On the contrary, genuine feeling is expressed by Herc. Fur. 1004: scelus nefandum, triste et aspectu horridum. Here the meter precludes the possibility of an *o* having dropped out.

clamation occupies the same relative position.¹ Since only one of Pliny's works is extant in addition to the *Epistulae*, for the sake of completeness I have included instances from the *Panegyricus* in the following discussion.

Epist. VIII, 13, 2: o te beatum, cui etc.²

Pan. LXX, 2: o te dignum, qui etc.

LXXIV, 1: o te felicem!

LXXIV, 4: o nos felices!

This list includes all the cases involving a personal pronoun, except Epist. II, 10, 1 (see below).

Epist. I, 9, 6: o rectam sinceramque vitam,
o dulce otium honestumque ac paene omni
negotio pulchrius!

o mare,

o litus, verum secretumque *μυστήριον*, quam
multa invenitis, quam multa dictatis!

V, 16, 6: o triste plane acerbumque funus!

o morte ipsa mortis tempus indignius!

VI, 11, 1: o diem laetum!

VI, 11, 3: o diem (repetam enim) laetum notan-
dumque mihi candidissimo calculo!

VII, 20 2: o iucundas,

o pulchras vices!

Pan. VII, 1: o novum atque inauditum ad principatum
iter!

LXXX, 3: o veras principis atque etiam dei curas,
reconciliare etc.

LXXXVI, 2: o rem memoriae litterisque mandandam!

The above instances present nothing which calls for special comment.³

¹ It is significant that not a single accusative of exclamation occurs in the correspondence with Trajan.

² Citations are taken from C. F. W. Müller's edition of Pliny.

³ Note should also be taken of Epist. II, 20, 5: *clamat moriens hominem nequam, perfidum ac plus quam periurum, qui sibi per salutem filii peierasset*. Professor E. T. Merrill in his edition ad loc. explains as follows: "the construction is a vivid adaptation of the actual accusative of exclamation to that of the direct object of *clamat*; cf. Liv. XXI, 62, 2: *infantem triumphum clamasse* (in direct form 'triumpe')." Perhaps better parallels would be Cic. Att. XI, 9, 2: *venerunt scelus hominis clamantes* and Hor. Sermon. I, 2, 130: *miseram se conscia clamat*. It must be further noted, however, that

There remain the passages in which *o* does not accompany the construction; every one of them exhibits the developments already noted in Cicero and Seneca.

Epist. II, 10, 1: *hominem te patientem vel potius durum
ac paene crudelem, qui tam insignes
libros tam diu teneas!*

In urging Octavius to publish his poems Pliny banteringly charges him with being too hard-hearted to gratify his friends.

Epist. II, 20, 2: *primum impudentiam hominis, qui venerit
ad aegram, cuius marito inimicissimus,
ipsi invisissimus fuerat!*

Pliny has some good stories to tell about Regulus. The exuberance of his spirits appears with the very first words: *assem para et accipe auream fabulam, fabulas immo*. As he comes to the accusative of exclamation you can fairly see him rolling the sweet morsel under his tongue. The playful, bantering tone is reflected in the omission of the *o*.

Epist. IV, 21, 1: *tristem et acerbum casum Helvidiarum
sororum!*

This is written in sincere pity and sorrow, cf. Cic. ad Att. XIII, 22, 2: *rem*¹ *acerbam*, referring to the assassination of Marcellus.

Pan. XIX, 4: *felices illos, quorum fides et industria non
per internuntios et interpretes, sed ab
ipso te nec auribus tuis, sed oculis
probabantur!*

The irony in this case consists in the injection of the phrases *non per internuntios et interpretes* and *nec auribus tuis* with their implication of less happy times gone by.

Pan. LVIII, 4: *miseros ambitionis, qui ita consules semper
ut semper principes erant!*

This is spoken in mock commiseration of some of Trajan's predecessors.

there is some manuscript authority for reading *o hominem nequam*, etc., which would give us the direct discourse. But the editors uniformly follow the superior authority and omit the *o*. This variant reading shows how easily the *o* crept in where it did not belong and how seriously similar situations in Cicero ought to be regarded.

¹ The text of this passage is discussed on p. 291 above.

STATISTICAL TABLE.

	Plautus	Terence ¹	Cicero	Seneca	Pliny
edepol.....	20	1
hercle.....	9	1
ecastor.....	2
other invocations.....	4	8	1	1 ²	..
o { with personal pronouns.....	7	3	4
{ other instances.....	13	26	79	17	13
heu.....	2	4
eheu.....	..	1
eugae.....	1
uah.....	..	1
ah.....	..	2
without interjections { with personal pronouns....	3	11	10	..	1
{ other instances.....	22	9	22	1	4
Average number of Teubner pages to each in-	76	64	119	22	22
stance.....	16	5	10	27	17

¹ The figures in this column have been altered to conform with the changes mentioned on p. 279, notes 1 and 3, above.

² A quotation from Cicero.

In conclusion it is evident that the accusative of exclamation was becoming less and less plastic. *O* has a position of increasing prominence and at last occurs even with personal pronouns. The non-interjectional usage, however, still has a place. All the other categories have practically been driven from the field. There is no basis for Müller's rule that a distinction can be drawn between the use of *o* "vor Sachen" and "bei Personen". A new development is found in the tendency for the omission of *o* to give a tone of commiseration or sarcasm. These observations have a bearing upon the constitution of the text at some fifteen points in Cicero's letters and at one point in Seneca's *Epistulae ad Lucilium*.

ROY C. FLICKINGER.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY.